

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-18, 20-31, 86-89, and 90-100 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 14, 21, and 90 are independent. Claims 1-4, 6-18, 20-31, and 86-89 have been rejected. Claims 90-100 have not been rejected and are therefore considered to be allowable.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-2, 4, 14, 16-18, and 86-88 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter (U.S. 5,359,345) in view of Walsh et al. (U.S. 5,886,681). Claims 3, 6-13, 15, 20-31, and 89 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as being unpatentable over Hunter and Walsh, and further in view of Jacobsen et al. (assumed to be U.S. 6,232,937). The rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The present application is directed towards a method and a system of writing an image on a liquid crystal display by automatically selecting a light source for illuminating the display based on a detected ambient light setting, writing the image to the display and flashing the selected light source to illuminate the display. As claimed, the brightness of the selected light source is adjusted based on the ambient light level. As also claimed, the color of the selected light source is automatically selected based on the ambient brightness level. For example, a “night” light source may be either a red LED or a blue green LED, depending on the use. While other colors are encompassed by the claims, a red LED could be used when it is important to maintain a person’s night vision, or a blue LED could be used when it is more important to be less detectable using night detection gear. (See Specification, p. 22, l. 16 - p. 23, l. 9).

Hunter discusses a shuttered and cycled LED display. The LEDs are arranged in arrays of red, green and blue. An LCD array of pixels is used to shutter light from the LEDs. The device is operated to provide persistence when changes in color are perceived by the human eye.

As shown in FIGS. 4 and 5 of Hunter, the LED light sources are not flashed after the LCD image is written, as claimed by the Applicants. Instead, Hunter opens the LCD shutters while the LEDs are illuminated. Hunter therefore does not perform the claimed repetitive writing, flashing, and setting steps.

Hunter also does not select a light source based on any brightness level. All that Hunter says about brightness is that “the average power transmitted or brightness level, can be excellent....” (Hunter, col. 7, lines 41-43). Hunter says nothing about altering brightness levels. Hunter simply shutters RGB LEDs to yield a full-color image.

Walsh discusses a dual-backlight display apparatus that can be used for day or light applications. Walsh uses photosensors (123a, 123b, 123c) to monitor the output levels of the lamps — not the ambient light level as stated in the Office Action. (Walsh, col. 3, lines 63-66). Although Walsh mentions that a ambient light sensor may provide “the ‘level select’ signal input to the cross-fade logic,” that function is different than using the ambient light level for “automatically selecting a light source” and “automatically adjusting the brightness of the light source” as claimed by the Applicants.

Furthermore, there is no motivation to combine Walsh with Hunter. Hunter is a color display system while Walsh is a day/night vision display. Hunter does not suggest a night vision application for the display or any other application that would require different light sources based on ambient light levels. Nor does Hunter motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to look to night vision displays. Without such a suggestion, the Office is presumed to be using the Applicants’ claims as motivation to combine Walsh with Hunter. That is improper hindsight, and does not support a prima facie rejection.

Jacobsen is cited for discussing display size and resolution and, for the steps of rendering images on the display. Jacobsen has been discussed in the prior remarks. Jacobsen does not cure the defects in combining Hunter and Walsh.

Reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that

a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

Rodney D. Johnson

Registration No. 36,558

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: *October 3, 2008*